TR-143170-P

Charles A. Moore
Project Engineer
BNSF Railway Company

2454 Occidental Ave. S.
Seattle, WA 98134
Tel 206-625-6211
Fax 206-625-6356
Email Chuck.Moore@bnsf.com

August 18, 2014

Kathy Hunter
Deputy Assistant Director, Trans. Safety
WUTC
1300 S Evergreen Park Dr. SW
PO Box 47250
Olympia, WA 98504-7250

Re: Petition for Construction/Reconstruction of Spruce St. (092260V) at Burlington in Skagit Co., WA

Dear Ms. Hunter

This letter is in support of the aforementioned WUTC petition on behalf of the BNSF Railway Company for highway-rail grade crossing upgrades at Spruce St (DOT No. 092260V) in Skagit Co. The following is supplemental information as provided in Section 12 of the petition for the proposed reconstruction.

The project is designed to increase the speed of trains traveling on the Anacortes Spur from 10mph to 20mph. The increase in speed will reduce the time that the Spruce St crossing is blocked by trains.

The proposed reconstruction of the crossing is to realign the track through the crossing from 0 to 6inches, which reduces the curvature in the track to allow the proposed increase in speed. The reconstruction of the crossing will replace all of the existing track material with new track material on the Anacortes Spur to help reduce additional closures due to maintenance. There will be no change in the existing vision distance from the proposed reconstruction.

The current method of warning is cross bucks with yield signs and crossing approach signs. The protection will be upgraded to flashing LED lights, gates and bell with predictor circuitry.

Please review the WUTC petition and feel free to contact me at 206-625-6211 if you have any questions.

Sincerely

Charles A. Moore

Charles A. Moore
Project Engineer

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

BNSF Rwy. Co. Petitioner, vs. City of Burlington, WA Respondent	)	DOCKET NO. TR- PETITION TO CONSTRUCT OR RECONSTRUCT A HIGHWAY-RAIL GRADE CROSSING USDOT CROSSING NO.: 092260V

Prior to submitting a Petition to **Construct** a highway-rail grade crossing and install an inter-tie between a Highway Signal and a Railroad Crossing Signal System to the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC), State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) requirements must be met. Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 197-11-865 (2) requires:

> **All actions of the utilities and transportation commission under statutes administered as of December 12, 1975, are exempted, except the following:**
>
> **(2) Authorization of the openings or closing of any highway/railroad grade crossing, or the direction of physical connection of the line of one railroad with that of another;**

Please attach sufficient documentation to demonstrate that the SEPA requirement has been fulfilled. For additional information on SEPA requirements contact the Department of Ecology.

The Petitioner asks the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission to approve construction or reconstruction of a highway-rail grade crossing.

☐ **Construction** **X Reconstruction**

Section 1 – Petitioner's Information

BNSF Rwy. Co.
Petitioner

Signature

2454 Occidental Ave.S.
Street Address

Seattle, WA 98134
City, State and Zip Code

Mailing Address, if different than the street address

Richard Wagner
Contact Person Name

206-625-6152, Richard.Wagner@bnsf.com
Contact Phone Number and E-mail Address

Section 2 – Respondent's Information

City of Burlington, WA
Respondent

833 S. Spruce Street
Street Address

Burlington, WA 98233
City, State and Zip Code

Mailing Address, if different than the street address

Marv Pulst
Contact Person Name

360-755-1334, MarvP@ci.burlington.wa.us
Contact Phone Number and E-mail Address

Section 3 – Proposed or Existing Crossing Location

1. Existing highway/roadway Spruce St

2. Existing railroad Burlington, WA

3. Location of proposed crossing:
   Located in the ____ 1/4 of the ____1/4 of Sec. 32, Twp. 35N, Range 4E W.M.

4. GPS location, if known 48°28"28"N, 122°19"51"W

5. Railroad mile post (nearest tenth) 16.53

6. City Burlington County Skagit

Section 4 – Proposed or Existing Crossing Information

1. Railroad company BNSF Railway

2. Type of railroad at crossing **x** Common Carrier □ Logging □ Industrial

   □ Passenger □ Excursion

3. Type of tracks at crossing □ Main Line **x** Siding or Spur

4. Number of tracks at crossing 1

5. Average daily train traffic, freight 6

   Authorized freight train speed 10 Operated freight train speed 10

6. Average daily train traffic, passenger 0

   Authorized passenger train speed N/A Operated passenger train speed N/A

7. Will the proposed crossing eliminate the need for one or more existing crossings?
   Yes ____ No X

8. If so, state the distance and direction from the proposed crossing.

9. Does the petitioner propose to close any existing crossings?
Yes ____ No X

Section 5 – Temporary Crossing

1. Is the crossing proposed to be temporary? Yes ____ No X

2. If so, describe the purpose of the crossing and the estimated time it will be needed

_____

_____

_____

3. Will the petitioner remove the crossing at completion of the activity requiring the temporary crossing? Yes ____ No N/A

Approximate date of removal _____

Section 6 – Current Highway Traffic Information

1. Name of roadway/highway Spruce St.

2. Roadway classification City Street

3. Road authority City of Burlington

4. Average annual daily traffic (AADT) 5969

5. Number of lanes 2

6. Roadway speed 25mph

7. Is the crossing part of an established truck route? Yes ____ No X

8. If so, trucks are what percent of total daily traffic? _____

9. Is the crossing part of an established school bus route? Yes ____ No X

10. If so, how many school buses travel over the crossing each day?_____

11. Describe any changes to the information in 1 through 7, above, expected within ten years:

_____

Section 7 – Alternatives to the Proposal

1. Does a safer location for a crossing exist within a reasonable distance of the proposed location?
   Yes ____ No N/A

2. If a safer location exists, explain why the crossing should not be located at that site.

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. Are there any hillsides, embankments, buildings, trees, railroad loading platforms or other barriers in the vicinity which may obstruct a motorist's view of the crossing?
   Yes ____ No N/A

4. If a barrier exists, describe:
   - ♦ Whether petitioner can relocate the crossing to avoid the obstruction and if not, why not.
   - ♦ How the barrier can be removed.
   - ♦ How the petitioner or another party can mitigate the hazard caused by the barrier.

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. Is it feasible to construct an over-crossing or under-crossing at the proposed location as an alternative to an at-grade crossing?
   Yes ____ No N/A

6. If an over-crossing or under-crossing is not feasible, explain why.

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. Does the railway line, at any point in the vicinity of the proposed crossing, pass over a fill area or trestle or through a cut where it is feasible to construct an over-crossing or an under-crossing, even though it may be necessary to relocate a portion of the roadway to reach that point?

Yes ____ No N/A

8. If such a location exists, state:
   - ♦ The distance and direction from the proposed crossing.
   - ♦ The approximate cost of construction.
   - ♦ Any reasons that exist to prevent locating the crossing at this site.

9. Is there an existing public or private crossing in the vicinity of the proposed crossing?

Yes ____ No N/A

10. If a crossing exists, state:
   - ♦ The distance and direction from the proposed crossing.
   - ♦ Whether it is feasible to divert traffic from the proposed to the existing crossing.

Section 8 – Sight Distance

1. Complete the following table, describing the sight distance for motorists when approaching the tracks from either direction.

a. Approaching the crossing from North , the current approach provides an unobstructed view as follows: (North, South, East, West)

Direction of sight (left or right)	Number of feet from proposed crossing	Provides an unobstructed view for how many feet
Right	300	55
Right	200	80
Right	100	Unobstructed
Right	50	1250
Right	25	940
Left	300	152
Left	200	490
Left	100	435
Left	50	415
Left	25	410

b. Approaching the crossing from South , the current approach provides an unobstructed view as follows: (Opposite direction-North, South, East, West)

Direction of sight (left or right)	Number of feet from proposed crossing	Provides an unobstructed view for how many feet
Right	300	55 (Due to Truck Parking)
Right	200	105 (Due to Truck Parking)
Right	100	365
Right	50	375
Right	25	380
Left	300	40
Left	200	50
Left	100	90
Left	50	260
Left	25	315

2. Will the new crossing provide a level approach measuring 25 feet from the center of the railway on both approaches to the crossing?

Yes ____ No X

3. If not, state in feet the length of level grade from the center of the railway on both approaches to the crossing. 5ft

4. Will the new crossing provide an approach grade of not more than five percent prior to the level grade?

Yes X No ____

5. If not, state the percentage of grade prior to the level grade and explain why the grade exceeds five percent.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Section 9 – Illustration of Proposed Crossing Configuration

Attach a detailed diagram, drawing, map or other illustration showing the following:

- ♦ The vicinity of the proposed crossing.
- ♦ Layout of the railway and highway 500 feet adjacent to the crossing in all directions.
- ♦ Percent of grade.
- ♦ Obstructions of view as described in Section 7 or identified in Section 8.
- ♦ Traffic control layout showing the location of the existing and proposed signage.

Section 10 – Sidewalks

1. Provide the following information:
   a. Provide a description of the type of sidewalks proposed.
   b. Describe who will maintain the sidewalks.
   c. Attach a proposed diagram or design of the crossing including the sidewalks.

_____

There will be no changes to the existing sidewalks.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Section 11 – Proposed Warning Signals or Devices

1. Explain in detail the number and type of automatic signals or other warning devices planned at the proposed crossing, including a cost estimate for each. If requesting pre-emption include the type of train detection circuitry, sequencing and advanced preemption time, justification for the changes and its effects on current warning devices and warning times for drivers.

Cross Bucks with yield signs and crossing approach signs are currently in place. The Protection will be changed to flashing LED lights, gates and bell with predictor circuitry. Grade Crossing System will comply with current BNSF Grade Crossing Engineering and Construction Standards.

2. Provide an estimate for maintaining the signals for 12 months. _____

3. Is the petitioner prepared to pay to the respondent railroad company its share of installing the warning devices as provided by law?

Yes ____ No N/A

Section 12 – Additional Information

Provide any additional information supporting the proposal, including information such as the public benefits that would be derived from constructing a new crossing as proposed or modifying an existing crossing. Provide project specific information.

The realignment of track through the road crossing will allow the increase of train speed to 20mph from 10mph across the road crossing. This will decrease the amount of time the crossing will be blocked by trains.

Section 13 – Waiver of Hearing by Respondent

Waiver of Hearing

The undersigned represents the Respondent in the petition to construct or reconstruct a highway-railroad grade crossing and inter-tie the highway signal with the railroad crossing signal system.

USDOT Crossing No.: 084764A

We have investigated the conditions at the proposed or existing crossing site. We are satisfied the conditions are the same as described by the Petitioner in this docket. We agree that a crossing be installed or reconstructed and the highway signals inter-tied with the railroad crossing signal system and consent to a decision by the commission without a hearing.

Dated at _____ , Washington, on the _____ day of

_____, 20 ____.

_____

Printed name of Respondent

_____

Signature of Respondent's Representative

_____

Title

_____

Name of Company

_____

Phone number and e-mail address

_____

_____

Mailing address

Plot driver:pw:\spi-svr306.hanson.dom\Hanson Projects\Documents\Project_Workspace\MicroStation\Users\Clients\BNSF\BNSF_Railway\tables\pen\BNSF_Railway_pdf_hcf.pltcfg
Pen table:pw:\spi-svr306.hanson.dom\Hanson Projects\Documents\Jobs\R0087\CAD\Shared\Borders\BNSF_Railway_Color.tbl
File:pw:\spi-svr306.hanson.dom\Hanson Projects\Documents\Jobs\R0087\CAD\Rail\Sheet\C-7002-Spruce
Date:06\06\2014 Time:7:51:59 AM





HORIZ SCALE: 20' 0 10' 20' 40' 1" = 40'

VERT SCALE: 4' 0 2' 4' 8' 1" = 8'

REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY	SUB	APP
		PRELIMINARY NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION			

INFORMATION CONFIDENTIAL ALL PLANS, DRAWINGS SPECIFICATIONS, AND/OR INFORMATION FURNISHED HEREWITH SHALL REMAIN THE PROPERTY OF BNSF RAILWAY COMPANY AND SHALL BE HELD CONFIDENTIAL AND SHALL NOT BE USED FOR ANY PURPOSE NOT PROVIDED FOR IN AGREEMENTS WITH BNSF RAILWAY COMPANY.

DESIGNED BY	TGR
DRAWN BY	TGR
CHECKED BY	SWS
APPROVED BY	SWS
DATE	06\06\2014

BNSF RAILWAY

HANSON
Hanson Professional Services Inc.
11130 NE 33rd Place, Suite 200
Bellevue, Wa 98004
Offices Nationwide

BNSF RAILWAY
BELLINGHAM SUBDIVISION
BURLINGTON SIDING CONCEPTS
S SPRUCE ST. CROSSING PLAN AND PROFILE

CONTRACT NO.	13R0046
DRAWING NO.	C-7002
REVISION	SHEET NO. 2 OF 3
SCALE	AS SHOWN